

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 12, 2013

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Michael Crowley, Bob Breslau, Harry Venis (4:03 pm.), and Casey Lee. Also present were Mayor Paul, Planning and Zoning Manager David Quigley, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager David Abramson, and Janet Gale recording the meeting. Vice Chair Gus Khavanin was absent.

2. SITE PLANS

Modification

2.1 SPM 12-266, Parkside Estates, 8901 Orange Drive (AG)

The applicant, James Wright, waived the Quasi-Judicial process, and nobody from the public wished to speak on the item.

Mr. Abramson, representing Town staff, provided the staff report. The request is to allow five additional model types with three elevation types each. All the single family homes met the Rural Lifestyles criteria; the applicant provided a plan to staff, showing that all of the model types met setbacks and provisions for anti-monotony requirements. Mr. Abramson noted that staff has found the application complete and suitable for transmittal, and staff will receive recommendations from the committee.

Mr. Breslau confirmed that the drawings provided in the packet were the elevations for the five new models, not for the existing models. Mr. Abramson stated that they could use the previously approved elevations also, although they were much larger than the new ones. He continued that the Rural Lifestyles does allow various styles to co-exist.

Noting that they have to back out of their driveways, Mr. Breslau wondered if the potential movement of vehicles at the side-loaded garages had been measured. Mr. Abramson responded that the applicant had provided documentation on how the models would fit on each lot; Mr. Breslau said he would follow up with the applicant.

James Wright introduced himself as speaking on behalf of CC Devco Construction, 135 San Lorenzo Avenue, Suite 740, Coral Gables, Florida. Mr. Breslau asked Mr. Wright about the car movements, noting that when the cars would back up, they would be within 1.5 feet of a structure on the side. Mr. Wright commented that the first two models have a side-loaded garage where they would back up in front of the house. The third model (C) has a true side-loaded garage where it is off to the side of the house. The fourth and fifth models have an "H-home" plan, with the garage on the front, sort of a courtyard arrangement.

Mr. Breslau questioned how a car at Model B would be able to back out of the garage and turn without hitting one of the round columns. Mr. Wright replied that the round columns are actually set back two feet from the garage exit. Mr. Breslau maintained that the car would swing out two to three feet as it turns. Mr. Wright said they have not built that exact model, but the front porch and garage are the same as three of the models in Montara. He said those driveways are narrower, and most people back in. Mr. Breslau wanted to see a radius drawing from a civil or traffic engineer to certify that a full-sized car would not hit the house or columns trying to make the turn in or out.

Mr. Breslau suggested banding on the sides of the pillars (shown on the elevations) or banding around the windows to break up the long horizontal wall. Mr. Wright commented that the builder would probably not object to that. He said they can also have an engineer look at the turning radii coming out of the garages.

Ms. Lee asked if there was an option for a resident who might want stack stone on the façade. Mr. Wright said that would require an elevation change and would be too much work.

Ms. Lee also wondered if they were going to stay with the same landscape plan that was originally approved. Mr. Wright said they have an upgraded plan for each unit, and they installed the original landscape plan and then received an upgrade plan approval from Public Works. They have added a

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 12, 2013

significant amount of material. Mr. Abramson said that additions such as the oaks and royal palms did not require revisiting the Site Plan Committee.

Chair Crowley wondered if they would use any of the old models, and Mr. Wright replied that they do not intend to use those. Regarding the five vacant lots, Mr. Wright remarked the owners have the option to build. There may be future actions regarding the two existing houses.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Ms. Lee, to approve the application subject to two conditions: 1) that the applicant provide radius drawings by a traffic or civil engineer that show that a third full-size vehicle in the double garages of all models can make safe reverse movements without conflicts with structures or landscaping; and 2) that the applicant add decorative banding on the sides of all models and on the front and rear walls where appropriate. In a vote by roll call, with Vice Chair Khavanin being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

Master Site Plan

2.2 MSP 12-188, Palm Ranch Estates, 7201 Stirling Road (A-1)

Applicant Jay Evans from Pillar Consultants, 5230 South University Drive, Davie, appeared, representing P.A.C. Land Development and owner MJB Development. He stated no objection to waiving the Quasi-Judicial process. Nobody from the public wished to speak on the item.

Mr. Abramson, representing Town staff, provided the staff report. He stated that the site is 21 acres and was formerly a nursery. The application is to develop the property with a new 224 garden apartment rental community, consisting of 60 one-bedroom units, 72 two-bedroom units, 68 three-bedroom units, and 24 four-bedroom units. Mr. Abramson pointed out two additional applications: a plat application for boundary plat restricting the number of units; and a rezoning application to rezone the southern portion of the property from A-1 to RM-16.

Mr. Abramson summarized the history of the project, which was provided in the agenda backup material. If approved, staff recommended six items and requested the project be revised prior to submission to the Town Council (see detail attached). Mr. Abramson mentioned the matter will go before the Town Council on April 3, 2013.

Mr. Breslau asked how many units would be lost if they reduced the building mass as described in recommendation #6. Mr. Abramson thought there could be 8 - 12 units lost, although they might modify some other units to make up for that.

Mr. Evans said the project has gone through the DRC process and has been deemed to meet code. They had many public meetings and also specific meetings with neighbors to address concerns. The north six acres will remain A-1 zoning and will not have any residential buildings on it. The overall density of the project is about 10.7 units per acre.

Mr. Evans pointed out that one building on the north side is a combination of two and three stories, although originally the project called for all three stories. He said that the number of units has already been reduced as much as possible. He added that the buildings are already a football field away from other houses in the neighborhood.

Mr. Evans continued they have gone to great lengths to go "above and beyond the code." As an example, he cited the landscaping changes, setbacks, parking spaces, open space area, and handicap/ADA complaint spaces. Mr. Evans stated they have entered into a recorded agreement with the Town addressing their commitments.

Mr. Evans remarked the development will have an 18,000 square foot recreational facility, a resort-style apartment pool, social and cabana area, fitness centers, indoor basketball court, cyber lounge and more.

Mr. Evans noted there will be no access from 70 Avenue and they are expanding and reshaping the existing canal to meet Central Broward Water Control District standards. Controlled access will be via guard gates at the entrance on Stirling Road, the sole entrance in and out of the project. He also noted

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 12, 2013

they will have bike racks. There will be a single trash collection location at the front, and onsite car wash facility and an onsite maintenance building. He informed the committee that they have nearly 100 petitions supporting the project.

Mr. Evans responded to the six staff recommendations:

1. (Landscape buffer) - The builder's intent has always been to have a 20 foot buffer.
2. (Consistent roof materials) - They would like to keep the two different materials for architectural accenting purposes.
3. (Sidewalks on east and west) - Their concern is to maintain security, and they would prefer not to add the pathways; they could possibly put pass codes on the walkways if necessary. He noted they provide access to Stirling Road, which has a sidewalk.
4. (Balconies) - They have an "extreme disagreement" on removing the balconies on the north side of the buildings. He reiterated that the buildings are a "football field" away from the neighbors. In addition, there is a lake, 20 feet of heavy landscaping on the project's side, a 6-foot wall, 10 feet of landscaping on the neighbor's side, a roadway and then their front yards before getting to their houses. Not having balconies and windows would prevent the occupants from enjoying the amenities, and Mr. Evans added that these objections came up at the very beginning of the Land Use Amendment process.
5. (Non-transparent pool fence) - They want the people using the pool to be able to enjoy the landscaping, fountains, etc. He felt it was an unreasonable request.
6. (Reduce massing of buildings) - To do this, they would have to lose additional units.

Mr. Breslau asked Mr. Abramson if the request for the standing seam metal on the roofs came from staff, and he said that came from staff because they usually approve a consistent roofing material. Drawings were shown of the two roof types, noting that the shingled part consists of architectural shingles (textured). By consensus, the committee preferred the applicant's design over the staff recommendation in #2.

Regarding recommendation #3, the committee agreed by consensus that it was better to have only one entrance/exit, and thus, disagreed with #3.

Regarding recommendation #4, Mr. Abramson mentioned that the comment was also part of the Site Plan discussion, not only the Land Use Amendment discussion. Chair Crowley thought the matter of balconies was an issue better addressed by the Town Council, as it is a matter of aesthetics. Other than that, the committee thought the balconies should stay.

Chair Crowley brought up recommendation #5 (pool fence), and the landscape architect Scott McClure, 1016 Northeast 45 Street, Oakland Park, said there is a four-foot fence around the pool. Between the fence and the lake is a small landscaped area that will remain low in order to see the lake. By consensus, the committee preferred the architect's design over staff's recommendation.

Regarding recommendation #6, Chair Crowley thought the massing was adequate and that they should not have to lose units. By consensus, the committee agreed not to support #6.

Ms. Lee asked the applicant how the 20 foot buffer (#1) would affect Central Broward and the walking path. The reply was that it was out of the easement and the landscaping would meander around the walkway.

Mr. Breslau wondered if every building would be painted identically. Steve Solaro, Forum Architecture and Interior Design, 731 Orienta Avenue, Altamonte Springs, Florida, stated that the buildings would all be done in the colors on the color palette shown. Buildings that are identical structures would be painted the same color. Mr. Breslau wondered if they would consider modifying their palette, so as to not end up with eight identical buildings. Mr. Solaro explained that each building has four or five different building types, so the massing changes slightly between the types. They would like to keep the colors in the same general areas if possible.

Tom Cavanaugh, principal at P.A.C. Land Development Corporation, 730 Bonny Brae Street, Winter Park, Florida, commented he liked the idea of painting different colors in different color

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 12, 2013

sequencing or location (within the given color palette). A brief discussion ensued on the advantages of varying the colors of paint.

Regarding the garbage compactor, it was noted that a heavy door was needed. Mr. Evans showed an example of such a facility. He said the doors are synthetic and solid, and they would be willing to add some decorative features to the doors, such as arches. Mr. Breslau was curious how the residents would get their garbage to the area, and Mr. Evans replied they would walk or drive it there. He said it is becoming common for residents to drop off their garbage on the way out. There is a row of parking spaces next to the dumpster area. Mr. Breslau requested they add a sign to those parking spaces saying they are for dumpster drop-off and pick-up only.

Mr. Breslau asked about the photometric, noting they meet zero at the old property line, not the new property line. He was concerned that if they meet zero at the new property line, there might not be enough light in the parking area. Mr. Abramson said they have to meet zero along the new line, but it would be .5, not zero. Mr. Breslau thought they did not have enough light at the entrance and suggested maintaining a 3.0 average throughout the entrance areas.

Mayor Paul entered the meeting at this point.

Ms. Lee wondered if the irrigation plan had been submitted for the entire site, and it was noted it had, although no hard copy was provided. She asked what sequence they planned to follow in doing the four sides of the landscaping; Mr. Evans replied they have not yet planned it out, but will comply with code. Once the nursery material is removed, they have to dig the lake. They have secured quite a bit of the nursery's materials for their plantings.

Ms. Lee suggested adding brick to the guard house, and the applicant responded it could have some cultured stack stone.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Venis, to approve subject to the following conditions: 1) staff's recommendation number one is accepted (correctly illustrate the double landscape buffer along the northern property line. This would entail doubling the width [from 10 feet to 20 feet] dimension required per the land development code.), and staff's recommendations two through six are not to be included in this recommendation; 2) the applicant will adjust the accent colors on the buildings to add variety to the painted surfaces from colors within the approved palette submitted; 3) the applicant will add decorator features to the trash compactor doors at the entrance of the project; 4) that the east property line photometric will meet code based on where the new property line is located; 5) the applicant will add additional lighting at the entrance to achieve a 3.0 average lighting level; and 6) the applicant will add a stone feature base to the guard house on all four sides with material consistent with the cultured stone used on the entrances and the rest of the project. In a vote by roll call, with Vice Chair Khavanin being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3. OLD BUSINESS

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

None.

5. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

None.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 12, 2013

6. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Date Approved: _____



Chair/Committee Member